## **EXHIBIT 122**

Ī	Page 1
1	
2	그리오 시간 왕인 경기 보고 있다. 이 경기 전략 전략 보이는 그렇게 되어 되어 되었다. 그 보고 있는 모든 경기 전략에 다른 것이다. 그런데 이 2000년 전략
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
4	FINANCIAL CRISIS INQUIRY COMMISSION
5	마마스 유민들이 전한 호텔은 교리는 내 이에 사용했다고 있다. 그리는 보고 있는 사람은 그리는 것이 없었다. 한 12일부터 전환 1일부터 전환 경기를 통해 보고 있다. 경기를 가장 보고 있는 것이 되었다.
6	는 사람들은 경기에 가장 하는 것을 하고 있다. 그런 사람들은 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그런
7	Official Transcript
8	
9	Interview of Mary Haggerty
10	August 17, 2010
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE FCIC:
16	VICTOR CUNICELLI
17	THOMAS KREBS
18	THOMAS BORGERS (TELEPHONICALLY)
19	MINA SIMHAI (TELEPHONICALLY)
2 0	x
2 1	
2 2	
23	
2 4	
2.5	5

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY www.veritext.com

212-267-6868

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT NO. 140
S PORTION PROTECTION
S DATE: 9/12 RPTR: 14

Page 2 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 MR. CUNICELLI: This is Victor 3 Cunicelli of the Financial Crisis Inquiry 4 Commission. Today's date is August 17, 5 2010. The time is approximately 11 a.m. 6 I'm accompanied by Tom Krebs of the 7 FCIC and Tom Borgers telephonically, and Mary Haggerty of J.P.Morgan and several 8 9 Paul Weiss attorneys. 10 We are at the offices of Paul Weiss, 11 New York, for the interview of Ms. 12 Haggerty. This interview will be 13 recorded with the consent of Ms. 14 Haggerty. 15 Could I please get your verbal assent for the record? 16 17 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes, I agree. 18 MR. CUNICELLI: Okay, great. 19 Will everyone please state your full 20 name and affiliation for the record? 21 please spell your last name for the 22 transcriptionist. I'll start. 23 Cunicelli is C-U-N-I-C-E-L-L-I. 24 MR. KREBS: Tom Krebs, K-R-E-B-S, 25 FCIC.

	Page 3
1	FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010
2	MS. HAGGERTY: Mary Haggerty,
3	H-A-G-G-E-R-T-Y, J.P.Morgan Securities,
4	
5	MS. CAREY: Jessica Carey,
6	C-A-R-E-Y, Paul Weiss.
7	MS. JENS: Linda Jens, J-E-N-S,
8	JPMorgan Chase.
9	MR. GOLDSTEIN: Eric Goldstein,
10	G-O-L-D-S-T-E-I-N, Paul Weiss.
11	MR. PATERSON: Paul Paterson,
12	P-A-T-E-R-S-O-N, Paul Weiss.
13	MR. CUNICELLI: Okay.
14	In the way of background, Ms.
15	Haggerty, the FCIC was established by
16	statute, Public Law 111-21, and signed
17	into law by the President. It is
18	bipartisan and consists of ten
19	
20	examining the causes of the financial
21	
22	
2 3	
2 4	
25	President and Congress by December 15,

Page 4 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 2010. 3 The commission may compel attendance 4 and testimony of witnesses and production of records. 6 I can provide a copy of the statute 7 by which the commission was formed if you 8 so desire. 9 Be advised the FCIC is an agency of 10 the United States and FCIC staff are 11 federal employees under the aegis of 18 12 Unites States Code Section 1001 13 concerning false statements. 14 If -- at all times, if you mention a 15 proper name, a last name, if you could 16 spell it the first time you mention it. 17 If not, we'll try and -- try and remind 18 you throughout. And just make sure that 19 all your responses are verbal, audible --20 MS. HAGGERTY: Okav. 21 MR. CUNICELLI: -- and you should be 22 good to go. 23 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. 24 MR. KREBS: Mary, thank you for 25 coming in this morning. I really

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 appreciate it.

Could you give us a little of your background, please?

MS. HAGGERTY: Sure. I graduated from college in 1982. I went to State University of New York at Albany and got a Bachelor's degree in accounting. Went to work for Arthur Young, which is one of the Big Eight public accounting firms. And in 1985, went to work at Bear Stearns.

Initially, in their back office, I did the operational side of their initial mortgage conduit that they operated in the '80s. Left the firm in beginning of 1989 to move to Cleveland, Ohio, and worked for a small firm there for three years. And in '92, came back to New York and back to Bear Stearns, where I worked in the mortgage-backed securities department until the merger with J.P.Morgan.

At the merger with J.P.Morgan, I transferred to JPMSI, the structured

Page 6 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 products group, also working in the 3 mortgage department. And then in March 4 of this year, transferred within 5 structured products to another division that manages the firm's principal 6 7 investments in delinquent tax liens. 8 MR. KREBS: Who was your immediate 9 supervisor at Bear Stearns while you were 10 with the mortgage-backed securities 11 department? 12 MS. HAGGERTY: It changed from time 13 to time, but it was Tom Marano, who we 14 just spoke about, and Jeff Verschleiser. 15 MR. KREBS: What was your job there, 16 at the mortgage-backed securities 17 department? What were you doing for Tom? 18 Or --19 MS. HAGGERTY: I did a number of 20 different things during my tenure there. 21 So when I first started again, the second 22 time in 1992, I was in the home loan 23 securitization group, which was

family residential mortgage loans.

responsible for securitizing one-to-four

24

Page 7 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 continued in that position and became co-2 head of that group in 1996. 3 And then in 2001, my job 4 responsibilities shifted when Tom Marano 5 asked me to start up and manage a 6 mortgage conduit. 7 MR. KREBS: What was that mortgage 8 conduit? 9 It was an operation MS. HAGGERTY: 10 by which a subsidiary of the Bear Stearns 11 Companies, called EMC Mortgage, would buy 12 whole loans -- one-to-four family 13 residential mortgage loans -- from 14 sellers of, and originators of, these 15 loans and securitize them into mortgages. 16 And to mortgage-backed securities, sorry. 17 MR. KREBS: And ultimately, were 18 those mortgages to be securitized? 19 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 20 MR. KREBS: How did you go about 21 acquiring mortgages for securitization 22 purposes? 23 MS. HAGGERTY: Well, there's a lot 24 of steps to that. 25

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

The firm employed salespeople that would maintain relationships with the originators of the mortgages. So one step is to find out who is creating them and talk to them about selling them to you.

The other thing that you would do to go about doing that is just create the parameters under which you would buy the loans. And so the trading desk would work on that, along with the mortgage securitization group.

MR. KREBS: Did you buy these securities in pools or did you buy them individually?

MS. HAGGERTY: Earlier on, we bought the loans in pools. And then the -- in 2001 is when we started -- actually, it was in 2002 when we bought the first ones. But we built the operation within EMC to buy individual loans, one by one.

MR. KREBS: Ultimately, what did you do with those loans that were acquired by EMC, that had been acquired one by one?

Page 9 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: They also were 2 securitized. 3 MR. KREBS: Who was in the charge of 4 the securitization and who did -- with 5 whom did you work at the securitization 6 desk? 7 MS. HAGGERTY: The co-head with me 8 of the securitization group was Baron 9 Silverstein, S-I-L-V-E-R-S-T-E-I-N. 10 MR. KREBS: Was it Baron? 11 MS. HAGGERTY: Yeah. Baron, like 12 Snoopy and the Red. B-A-R-O-N. 13 MR. KREBS: Which loan originators 14 did you utilize to acquire these loans? 15 MS. HAGGERTY: There were more than 16 a hundred of them. Between 1- and 200, I 17 think. And they ranged in size from 18 small originators to large ones like 19 Countrywide and Wells Fargo. 20 MR. KREBS: I imagine this was a 21 relatively smaller part of the mortgage 22 market when you're looking at one-to-23 fours or -- is that what you said --24 family. 25

Page 10 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 MS. HAGGERTY: One-to-four family 3 products secured the loans, yeah. MR. KREBS: I imagine it was a much small -- was it a much smaller group than 5 6 was in the mortgage industry generally? 7 MS. HAGGERTY: Well, I think the 8 largest part of the industry would sell 9 to Fannie and Freddie. Yeah, so this was what we would call non-agency. 10 11 MS. CAREY: Did somebody just join 12 on the line? 13 MS. SIMHAI: Yes. Yes, this is Mina 14 Simhai with the Financial Crisis Inquiry 15 Commission. 16 MR. KREBS: Can you describe for us 17 the methodology that you used to acquire 18 loans from those originators? Would you 19 take bids? How would you do it? 20 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. There were two 21 basic business lines. And I would 22 describe one as flow and the other as 23 bulk. 24 So we'll start with bulk. Bulk is a 25 situation where the originator aggregates

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 a certain number of mortgage loans for sale. And it could be anywhere from a million dollars' worth of mortgage loans to a billion dollars' worth of mortgage loans. Again, depending on the size of the originator and their capacity to aggregate these and hold them for sale.

And so what an originator that was selling bulk would typically do is have relationships with several investors.

And they would send, typically, an Excel spreadsheet that listed the loans that they were offering and then certain attributes about each of the loans, things like the original balance, the property type, the interest rate, what kind of a loan was it, meaning was it fixed-rate or adjustable. Those types of things. And --

MR. KREBS: Is this what's called the tape?

MS. HAGGERTY: Yes --

MR. KREBS: Okay.

MS. HAGGERTY: -- except they're not

Page 12 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 tapes anymore; they're Excel 3 spreadsheets --MR. KREBS: (Indiscernible). MS. HAGGERTY: -- but yes, the tape. 5 6 And so they would send the tape out 7 and -- to several different investors. 8 And they would say we'd like bids on this 9 by a certain date. And the investors --10 potential investors would bid and the 11 originator would make a selection and 12 award the bid. 13 MR. KREBS: In connection with the 14 bid --MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. 15 16 MR. KREBS: -- was the -- was it 17 contemplated that a sample would be done 18 for due diligence purposes? 19 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. And it was --20 would either be a sample or every single 21 loan would be looked at. 22 MR. KREBS: Did the bid 23 oftentimes -- or ever specify the size of the sample to be taken in connection with 24 25 the submission of a bid?

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

MS. HAGGERTY: What we typically did at Bear was a commitment letter that would go out within, say, twenty-four hours of a trade. And in that commitment letter, we would typically specify due diligence. And I -- it's hard for me to remember exactly, but it would make sense to me that at least in some circumstances, at the time of the bid, we would say what -- how much diligence we were going to do, meaning the percentage of the pools that would be looked at.

MR. KREBS: Did the material submitted by the originator also contain reps and warranties or were those negotiated later?

MS. HAGGERTY: The reps and warranties would be negotiated later, typically, in the mortgage loan purchase agreement. And then oftentimes, a master mortgage loan purchase agreement could be entered into between EMC and a seller. And then if you have subsequent trades, they would be settled via a term sheet.

Page 14 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 So you use those same reps and 3 warranties, same agreement, and then the term sheet would just specify whatever 5 was different for that particular trade. 6 MR. KREBS: Was EMC also involved in 7 the origination business or was it merely 8 a conduit for Bear Stearns securitization 9 process? 10 MS. HAGGERTY: EMC was a purchaser 11 and seller of loans; EMC did not 12 originate itself. 13 MR. KREBS: Did EMC have, 14 internally, its own underwriting 15 guidelines? 16 MS. HAGGERTY: EMC did publish a set 17 of guidelines, yes. 18 MR. KREBS: And those guidelines 19 were available to anybody who wanted to 20 submit a bid to EMC so they knew 21 beforehand what your standards are? 22 MS. HAGGERTY: The guidelines were 23 available to anybody that wanted to have 24 People could submit bids or we them. 25 would bid on product if the -- the seller

Page 15 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 was approved by EMC. 2 MR. KREBS: Did those underwriting 3 quidelines change? MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 5 MR. KREBS: Did they change between 6 2005 and 2006? But I'm not going to let 7 you guess; I'm just going ahead to look 8 right here. 9 Here, this will help. We'll use 10 this as Exhibit Number 1. 11 MS. HAGGERTY: Thank you. 12 MR. KREBS: This appears to be a 13 subprime credit profile. And you'll 14 notice it's revised at the top on 1 --15 5/1 of '05. And it says -- on the right-16 hand side, it says "date of last change 17 to credit profile was 5/18 of '05". I 18 think --19 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. 20 MR. KREBS: -- is that -- I'm not 21 sure I'm reading that correctly --22 revised 5/1/05 -- or 5/18/05. So that 23 indicates there was at least one that was 24 different than the one we're looking at 25

Page 16 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 now in existence before this date. 3 that correct? MS. HAGGERTY: Well, this is a 5 document that looks like it was prepared 6 by Clayton. Is that right? 7 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 8 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay, I've not seen 9 this document, to my recollection. 10 let's take a look at it. 11 MR. KREBS: Well -- yes, go -- the 12 right hand. Look at it if you'd like. 13 But I'm going to ask you some questions about it. 14 15 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. 16 MR. KREBS: You'll see under the top heading, says "client-specific rejects". 17 18 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. 19 MR. KREBS: That means loans that 20 the client, meaning EMC Bear, would not 21 accept, is that correct? 22 MS. HAGGERTY: It appears to be the 23 case, yeah. 24 MR. KREBS: And it says "unless you 25 advise us to the contrary", we would

	Page 17
1	FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010
2	review "should we review loans to the
3	seller's guidelines". Now, what seller
4	are they talking about at that point?
5	That would be the loan originator
6	origination firm?
7	MS. HAGGERTY: I would assume so. I
8	mean, I'm guessing a little bit just
9	because I haven't seen this document
10	before, but
11	MR. KREBS: Okay.
12	MS. HAGGERTY: but that would
13	make sense to me. Seller would be
14	whoever's selling to Clayton's client,
15	who's EMC.
16	MR. KREBS: Are you familiar with
17	Clayton's ranking of loans?
18	MS. HAGGERTY: I'm familiar with a
19	result of 1, 2 or 3
20	MR. KREBS: Okay.
21	MS. HAGGERTY: for both credit
22	and compliance.
23	MR. KREBS: Are you familiar with a
24	term called 2W?
25	MS. HAGGERTY: No.

Page 18 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MR. KREBS: Well, you will be before 3 the day is out. 4 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. 5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Sounds 6 ominous. 7 MR. KREBS: Well, I mean it's no 8 secret. And it's been published widely. 9 It's just that they were 1, 2 or 3. 1 is 10 accept; 2 is okay, maybe it's not perfect, but it has compensating factors; 11 12 and 3 is reject. 13 But what happens is when you get to 14 the 3s, oftentimes the purchaser waives 15 any prior constraints and they -- they 16 rank them as 2W, that's all. 17 But what I'm trying to get at here 18 is, if you look at the first bullet point 19 under the heading at the top that says "DTI" --20 21 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. 22 MR. KREBS: -- and that's debt to 23 income? 24 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes --25 MR. KREBS: And if you look --

Page 19 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: -- typically, debt-2 to-income ratio. 3 MR. KREBS: -- and if you look over 4 here to the right, it says Clayton 5 default is "EV-3 greater than sixty", is 6 that right? 7 MS. HAGGERTY: That's what it says, 8 yes. 9 MR. KREBS: But Bear-EMC preferences 10 are EV-3 greater than fifty-five. 11 Now, I -- I believe that EV means 12 event value -- or event 3, meaning it's a 13 reject. If it is over fifty-five on the 14 DTI, it's to be rejected. 15 MS. HAGGERTY: I believe that's what 16 it means, too. 17 MR. KREBS: All right. Are you 18 familiar with those? Are you familiar 19 with the underwriting standards that were 20 in play -- or in place then at Bear 21 Stearns, do you recall? And EMC during 22 2005/2006. 23 MS. HAGGERTY: I was at the time, 24 and so my recollection for what they may 25

Page 20 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 have been, specifically, back then, as I 3 sit here today, I -- I don't have a great 4 recall. 5 MR. KREBS: Go down the other, to the credit score. You see it's three 6 7 bullet points down? 8 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 9 MR. KREBS: And it says "EV-3 less 10 than 500". 11 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 12 MR. KREBS: But over here, it says 13 "depends on bid stips". What are bid 14 stips? 15 MS. HAGGERTY: When an originator 16 puts the pool out -- a bulk pool out for 17 bid --18 MR. KREBS: Uh-huh. 19 MS. HAGGERTY: -- they may say -- or 20 they would -- I'm sorry, the credit score would be one of those attributes that I 21 22 described. So when EMC would bid that, they bid the pool to the originator, they 23 may make a list of stipulations that goes 24 25 with that bid.

Page 21 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 So one of them might be we won't 2 accept anything with a credit score less 3 than 520, or it may be we wouldn't accept 4 anything with a credit score less than 5 500 or 600 or whatever it might be. 6 So that's what this would mean to 7 me; that, on an individual trade basis, 8 the instruction to Clayton would be for 9 the minimum credit score, take a look at 10 the terms of that particular deal. 11 MR. KREBS: That particular bid stip 12 that accompanied this particular due 13 diligence review? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: Correct. 15 MR. KREBS: What were other 16 variables that Bear Stearns would utilize 17 in connection with bid stips? Do you 18 recall? LTVs, CLTVs? 19 MS. HAGGERTY: Anything that was a 20

MS. HAGGERTY: Anything that was a loan-level attribute could be considered a bid stip, insofar as the originator or the seller is presenting that data --

MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

MS. HAGGERTY: -- and EMC is making

21

22

23

24

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 its bid based on that data.

So if there was a, you know, an LTV of ninety-five percent on that tape, EMC is saying, by accepting the -- or making a bid, that that's okay.

Sometimes, EMC or the trader may have created a set of bid stips that went in contradiction. So they may have -- the bid stip may have said maximum of ninety, even if there was a ninety-five on the tape. So yes, LTV would certainly be one, maximum loan amount might be one. Those are the -- the types of things that come to mind (indiscernible) --

MR. KREBS: Well, in fact, if you look here, down about the sixth bullet point, it says "LTVs or CLTVs over one hundred percent". The Clayton default would be to accept it, but the response here is it looks like Bear Stearns would say reject it unless otherwise specified.

MS. HAGGERTY: I'm, frankly, surprised to see Clayton accept that. That is unusual -- was unusual at the

Page 23 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 time in the industry. 2 MR. KREBS: What about negative am 3 loans, which are two lines down from 4 there? 5 MS. HAGGERTY: Neg am loans were a 6 specific product type that you typically 7 did not see in subprime. So it -- it's a 8 subprime credit profile. Again, I'm 9 surprise to see neg am along with 10 subprime. 11 MR. KREBS: Going down to cash-out 12 purchases --13 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. 14 MR. KREBS: -- do you see that? EV-15 3 is a Clayton default, but the answer --16 the -- Bear EMC preferences are to ask 17 Bear Stearns underwriting -- I guess 18 that's what that means, UW? 19 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes, that's what I 20 would assume it means. 21 Cash-out purchase. That's unusual. 22 MR. KREBS: Yeah. 23 MS. HAGGERTY: Cash-out refi is 24 usual. Cash-out purchase, I'm not 25

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 familiar with.

MR. KREBS: Would there be a series of bid stips or -- were your bid stips standard, at least with respect to subprime credit debt, do you recall?

MS. HAGGERTY: I don't recall, but I would say that, certainly, things change from time to time.

MR. KREBS: Do you recall having seen or actually eyeballed a series of bid stips with respect to the credit -- subprime credit?

MS. HAGGERTY: As I sit here today, no. I will tell you, back then, I'm sure I did look at them, but as I sit here today, I just don't recall.

MR. KREBS: Well, if I understand you that the invitation to bid is received and it -- and is accompanied with a tape and underwriting standards, and your response to that would be we will buy it under -- or we would like to make a bid under these conditions, which may or may not be acceptable to the

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 originator. And among those conditions was the bid stips, is that right?

MS. HAGGERTY: Yes.

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$  KREBS: Were reps and warranties from your side also part of that?

MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. The bids were always subject to the negotiation of the mortgage loan purchase agreement.

MR. KREBS: When were the reps and warranties negotiated? Were they at the front end or the back end, or at the front end and amended at the back end, depending on the due diligence review?

MS. HAGGERTY: They were never amended depending on the due diligence review. The reps were the reps. And the way I like to do the business is negotiate them up front before you even have a trade, because then everybody knows how we're engaging, we know how the trade is going to work. And you don't want to do a trade and then have things that might cause you to not settle.

MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

Page 26 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MS. HAGGERTY: So the more of the standard documentation or the 3 documentation required to close you can 5 do up front, the better. 6 So typically, you know, I always 7 advocated that let's get all the reps and 8 warranties negotiated up front, but it 9 didn't always work that way. Sometimes 10 we did a trade and then negotiated the mortgage loan purchase agreement prior to 11 12 settlement. 13 MR. KREBS: The trade, of course, 14 wasn't completed until such time as the 15 due diligence had been completed, is that 16 right? 17 MS. HAGGERTY: Typically, yes. 18 MR. KREBS: What were the factors 19 involved in the contingent purchase of 20 this pool? Can you tell me? 21 MS. HAGGERTY: The factors in the --22 MR. KREBS: Yeah, I mean what --23 what was it that was contingent? Was it 24 the reps and warranties had to be signed,

we had to make certain that certain

Page 27 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 percentage of loans were -- you didn't 2 have X percent reject -- rejected loans. 3 What were -- what were the 4 (indiscernible)? 5 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay, sure. Yes, the 6 mortgage loan purchase agreement had to 7 be negotiated and finalized and signed 8 off on. 9 With respect to the due diligence, 10 typically what we did at Bear Stearns is, 11 in subprime, and it -- and the due 12 diligence protocols varied by product. 13 So would you like to talk about subprime 14 specifically? 15 Sure. I mean let's do MR. KREBS: 16 subprime and then we'll come back to 17 others --18 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. 19 MR. KREBS: -- and find out how 20 different they were. 21 MS. HAGGERTY: For subprime, we --22 best of my recollection, we did a hundred 23 percent due diligence. We looked at 24 every loan for credit -- what we called 25

Page 28 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 credit -- which would have been a desk review of the loan file to see if it 3 conformed with the agreed-upon 5 underwriting guidelines. There would be 6 a compliance review. There would be a 7 data review, meaning that the -- the 8 loan-level information provided on the 9 tape -- or the Excel spreadsheet --10 matched the documents in the loan file. 11 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 12 MS. HAGGERTY: And then for 13 subprime, I believe we also did some sort 14 of review of the appraised value of the 15 property. And I -- I don't recall, as 16 we're sitting here, if those were -- if 17 we did BPOs or AVMs or drive-bys. I just don't recall what we did. 18 19 MR. KREBS: So you did credit -- you 20 did compliance as well --21 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 22 MR. KREBS: -- made sure -- and then 23 you did valuation. 24 MS. HAGGERTY: I believe we did, on 25 subprime.

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

MS. SIMHAI: When you said that you review to see if they matched to your agreed underwriting guidelines, what -- what was the agreed underline -- underwriting guidelines? Meaning, were they the guidelines of the originator, were they Bear Stearns' specific guidelines?

MS. HAGGERTY: They were both. What we did at EMC was we would review the originator's guidelines and approve them. We would either approve them as they were or we would approve them and say except for these three things, your guidelines are acceptable.

And oftentimes, what that really was tantamount to was comparing the originator's guidelines to an EMC guideline and highlighting the difference. So in some cases, we were using the originator's guidelines, and then in other cases, we used the originator's as modified to match EMC's guidelines.

Page 30 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MR. KREBS: How were those 3 modifications transmitted to the due diligence third party provider? 5 MS. HAGGERTY: They should have been 6 provided by Pattie Sears or John 7 Mongelluzzo, as the due diligence 8 managers. And Pattie Sears is S-E-A-R-S 9 and John Mongelluzzo is 10 M-O-N-G-E-L-L-U-Z-Z-O. 11 MR. KREBS: Were Pattie and John 12 responsible for affecting liaison with a 13 lead person from Clayton? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 15 MR. KREBS: Would they attend 16 offsite reviews with Clayton? 17 MS. HAGGERTY: Typically not. 18 MR. KREBS: How was it they would 19 communicate? That is, the due diligence 20 results. How would they be transmitted 21 back to Pattie and John? 22 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't have direct 23 knowledge of that, but I believe that it 24 would be via e-mail. And I also believe 25 they would have spoken on the phone

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 throughout the engagement.

MR. KREBS: Were the responses to the bids -- we've heard them described as overlays or as tolerances. Do you have any knowledge of the use of those terms with respect to the originator's guidelines -- underwriting guidelines?

MS. HAGGERTY: Overlays?

MR. KREBS: Uh-huh.

MS. HAGGERTY: I think overlays -and again, I'm guessing, depending on who
used the term. But as an industry term,
it would make sense to me that overlay
was what I just kind of described --

MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

MS. HAGGERTY: -- where you're comparing the originator's guidelines that they use to make the loans with, say, your own guidelines and what's different.

Just, as an example, let's say that the originator would to a ninety-five LTV to some loan amount, and you would only want to take a ninety-five LTV to a lower

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

loan amount. So you might say I accept

your guidelines, originator, except that

I'll only go to this loan amount for that

LTV.

MR. KREBS: So is it -- is it your impression that the materials provided as an overlay -- we'll use that as a term of ours -- were, perhaps, more stringent than the guidelines from the originator?

MS. HAGGERTY: I would say by definition, they should be. Because if the originators were less -- if the originator's guidelines were more conservative, let's say, than the investor's, there would be no reason to do an overlay, because by definition, that originator's guidelines would be will within the investor's guideline.

MR. KREBS: That's all that I have on that document.

What I'm going to show you is going to be marked as Exhibit Number 2 to your testimony. And that is Clayton -- you're familiar with Clayton, obviously.

Page 33 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 2 MR. KREBS: And did you use them as 3 a due diligence firm in connection with 4 preparing or reviewing loans in 5 connection with securitizations? 6 MS. HAGGERTY: We used Clayton as a 7 due diligence firm in connection with 8 purchasing bulk packages of whole loans, 9 yes. 10 MR. KREBS: All right. This is a 11 document. It's actually page 2 of the 12 document. And there's Bear EMC, and if 13 you'll look at the middle line where it 14 says "final rejection rate" --15 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. 16 MR. KREBS: -- you see that? 17 Yeah. MS. HAGGERTY: 18 MR. KREBS: Do you see where the 19 total Bear EMC final rejection rate is? 20 You see that that is a nine percent? 21 MS. HAGGERTY: I see nine percent, 22 23 yes. MR. KREBS: Do you know what waivers 24 are? 25

Page 34 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MS. HAGGERTY: I know what waivers 3 are in the context of Fannie Mae. MR. KREBS: Okay. Do you know 5 whether or not a waiver in this context 6 means that, notwithstanding that a loan 7 was ranked as 3, that on forty-two 8 percent of those loans ranked as 3, Bear 9 Stearns EMC waived them in an accepted 10 those loans? 11 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't know what 12 waiver means on this document. 13 MR. KREBS: Well, we have another 14 one that defines it --15 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. 16 MR. KREBS: -- all right? 17 MS. HAGGERTY: Sure. 18 MR. KREBS: Now, is it your -- I 19 understood that you -- you say that 20 Clayton did one hundred -- or you did one 21 hundred percent due diligence on the 22 loans, is that right? 23 MS. HAGGERTY: I think what I said 24 is that, typically for subprime, it was 25 our practice to do a hundred percent

Page 35 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 diligence, yes. 2 MR. KREBS: Are you saying -- do you 3 believe, then, that for the first quarter 4 of 2006 through the second quarter of 5 2007, that Bear Stearns had under -- had 6 due diligence performed at only 72,379 7 loans? That's on the line, right next to 8 the final reject. Right? 9 MS. HAGGERTY: I -- I don't know how 10 this document was created. I don't know 11 what 2006-1 means, 2006-3 means. I don't 12 know --13 MR. KREBS: Well I will represent to 14 you that 2006-1 is the first quarter of 15 2006 --16 MS. HAGGERTY: Oh, okay. 17 MR. KREBS: -- and the second 18 quarter of 2006, and so on until you get 19 down to 2007-2, which would be the second 20 quarter of 2007. 21 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. 22 MR. KREBS: And this purports to 23 be -- and we have the testimony behind 24 it -- to be an amalgamation of all the 25

Page 36 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 due diligence efforts done by Clayton. 3 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. MR. KREBS: Now, was Clayton the 5 exclusive due diligence firm employed by Bear Stearns EMC? 6 7 MS. HAGGERTY: No. 8 MR. KREBS: Who else did you 9 utilize? 10 MS. HAGGERTY: It was a company 11 called Watterson Prime that also, during 12 its tenure, was purchased by 13 PricewaterhouseCoopers --14 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 15 MS. HAGGERTY: -- so sometimes, they 16 called themselves Watterson Prime, and 17 sometimes, PwC. 18 MR. KREBS: Did you ever use Bohan 19 Group? 20 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes, but very early 21 on, and just for a couple of 22 transactions. 23 MR. KREBS: Did you ever use 406 24 Partners? 25 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't think so, no.

Page 37 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MR. KREBS: Are you familiar with 2 them? 3 MS. HAGGERTY: No. 4 MR. KREBS: Okay. 5 MS. HAGGERTY: I know them as a --6 maybe a BPO provider, if I'm remembering 7 right. 8 MR. KREBS: Did -- did you use any 9 other -- to your knowledge, sitting here 10 today, any other due -- third party due 11 diligence providers or vendors? 12 MS. HAGGERTY: Yeah, I think that we 13 tried one or two transactions with a 14 company called MortgageRamp. 15 MR. KREBS: MortgageRamp? 16 MS. HAGGERTY: Yeah, R-A-M-P, and 17 that would have been on Alt-A. 18 And then when we talk -- when we're 19 talking about due diligence and the firms 20 that we've just named --21 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 22 MS. HAGGERTY: -- we're talking 23 about the file review. The valuation 24 work is a separate group of vendors. 25

Page 38 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 MR. KREBS: I understand. So if, 3 for example, you had a question about the 4 valuation or the appraisal on a home, you 5 would go to one of these firms to ask them to either do a -- an automated 6 7 review, based on their database, or you'd have them send somebody to drive by -- or 8 9 maybe both -- to determine the value of 10 the home. Is that right? 11 MS. HAGGERTY: On subprime 12 transactions, we sometimes did that, yes. 13 That was not typically done on Alt-A or 14 jumbo product. 15 MR. KREBS: Approximately how many 16 transactions did -- if you can recall; I 17 know this may be a tough question. 18 many transactions did Bear Stearns engage 19 in in 2006 and through the second quarter 20 of 2007? 21 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't recall. 22 MR. KREBS: Did Bear Stearns have 23 its own captive origination firms? 24 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 25 MR. KREBS: Who was that?

Page 39 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: It was a company 2 called Bear Stearns Residential Mortgage 3 4 MR. KREBS: Bear Res? 5 MS. HAGGERTY: That's right. 6 MR. KREBS: Yeah. 7 MS. HAGGERTY: Bear Res. 8 MR. KREBS: Were -- was Bear Res 9 also a provider of mortgage loans that 10 were subsequently securitized? 11 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 12 MR. KREBS: Was due diligence 13 performed by third party due diligence 14 providers on the mortgages generated by 15 Bear Res? 16 MS. HAGGERTY: We hired staff from 17 the Clayton group to be on site at Bear 18 Res in the beginning of its operations --19 I don't recall exactly how long they 20 stayed -- so that we could -- we could do 21 that due diligence as the loans were 22 being made, rather than wait to have a 23 whole pool. 24 So that continued for some time. 25

Page 40 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 And I don't remember how long that 3 continued. 4 MR. KREBS: Do I understand to mean 5 that you employed employees of Clayton to 6 come over and assist you -- or to conduct 7 the due diligence work for Bear Res as 8 the loans were originated? 9 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes, in the beginning 10 of the operation. 11 MR. KREBS: What happened -- I mean 12 was there a time when that changed? 13 MS. HAGGERTY: Yeah, there was. And 14 I don't recall exactly when, but there 15 was a time where the results of those --16 that Clayton review was positive and we 17 felt that we didn't need to continue 18 that. 19 MR. KREBS: So you had brought your 20 staff up to speed to what Clayton knew 21 and they could do it on their own? 22 MS. HAGGERTY: The -- the team that 23 was assembled at Bear Res were very 24 seasoned mortgage originators, but yes, 25 with the -- with the startup of any, you

Page 41 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 know, new origination company, you want to make sure everything is running 3 smoothly. And so that's why we did that, 4 yes. 5 MR. KREBS: Were -- after the 6 Clayton folks departed, was due diligence 7 continued on Bear Res' mortgage loan 8 origination work? 9 MS. HAGGERTY: No. 10 MR. KREBS: It was not? 11 MS. HAGGERTY: Correct. 12 MR. KREBS: And -- and the --13 presumably, the belief was that the 14 people who were there originating loans 15 had grown up under the developmental --16 had been overviewed by Clayton and knew 17 what the standards were? 18 MS. HAGGERTY: That's right. 19 MR. KREBS: From 2003 to 2007, did 20 you ever notice a decline in the 21 underwriting standards in this industry, 22 the mortgage origination business? 23 MS. HAGGERTY: 2003 to 2007. 24 noticed in subprime, for example, that, 25

Page 42

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 over time, the maximum loan-to-value ratio that was accepted increased. That comes to mind specifically.

And also, over time, I think in the Alt-A programs, the same thing; that the -- the maximum combined loan-to-value ratios increased to a hundred percent, over time.

MR. KREBS: Did you see any deterioration in the FICO score?

MS. HAGGERTY: The FICO scores, I would say no. The banding for the FICO scores, in terms of guidelines, my recollection, it stayed pretty static.

Alt-A tended to be a minimum of 620 at the bottom, with the average around 680-ish. And subprime, I think, varied, depending on the originator. I think, over time, it became typical to -- to institute a minimum of 500 or 520, whereas, maybe prior to that, it was lower. And that had something to do, I think, with the increase in the LTV.

MR. KREBS: Any other areas where

Page 43 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 you saw or you observed deterioration on 2 a -- throughout an industry-wide basis? 3 MS. HAGGERTY: The other thing that 4 developed was the continuation of the 5 reduced documentation products. So 6 earlier on in Alt-A, you had full doc and 7 stated income --8 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 9 MS. HAGGERTY: -- and then what was 10 added over time was the no ratio product 11 and the no doc product, and the no 12 income, no asset verification product. 13 Any others? MR. KREBS: 14 MS. HAGGERTY: For -- in terms of 15 products themselves, a product that came 16 into the market during that time period 17 was for the neg am firms. 18 MR. KREBS: Well, what about the 19 3/27 and the 2/28 loans? Did you see a 20 lot of those? When did they come into 21 play? 22 MS. HAGGERTY: 3/27s and 2/28s were 23 traditionally the adjustable-rate 24 component of subprime. So those had 25

Page 44 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 always been part of the programs for 3 subprime. MR. KREBS: On the DTI, did you use 5 the teaser? Why did you use the ultimate 6 increase -- potential increased rate? 7 MS. HAGGERTY: To the best of my recollection, the guidelines used the 8 9 fully indexed rate to underwrite, to 10 qualify. 11 MR. KREBS: What number would they use? Would they make an estimate of the 12 13 number? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: An estimate of 15 income? 16 MR. KREBS: No -- you -- you're right. You're right. I withdraw that 17 18 question; I was chasing the wrong trail. 19 MR. CUNICELLI: If I could just get 20 one second. 21 MR. KREBS: Go. 22 MR. CUNICELLI: The -- the 2/28s and the 3/27s, they were always in -- in the 23 24 ARMs, but did you see an increase in 25 their use during that time, as a

Page 45 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 percentage of your portfolio? 2 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't really 3 recall. 4 MR. CUNICELLI: Okay. Thanks. 5 MR. KREBS: Did you -- did you see 6 an increase in the use of the Alt-As? 7 MS. HAGGERTY: The volumes that we 8 bought at Bear Stearns increased from 9 2003 to 2006, yes. Just in general, 10 across the board. 11 MR. KREBS: When you were approached 12 by an originator wanting to sell a pool, 13 what would you do to confirm or to verify 14 that his underwriting standards were as 15 he represented them? The due diligence 16 process, and that was it? 17 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 18 MR. KREBS: How often would you deal 19 with an originator with whom you had done 20 business before? 21 MS. HAGGERTY: So for -- an 22 originator that sells bulk would bring 23 packages maybe every two weeks or once a 24 month, just depending on their -- on the 25

Page 46 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 size of their origination book and their 3 warehouse capacity. So I -- I think it really varied. 5 We certainly didn't buy every pool 6 every time. I think at one point, during 7 the period, I just recall that we were at 8 like a twenty percent win rate, overall, 9 on the bulks that were presented. 10 MR. KREBS: I'm not sure I 11 understand that. Twenty percent? 12 MS. HAGGERTY: So if -- if a hundred 13 pools --14 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 15 MS. HAGGERTY: -- were presented to 16 us over a time a period --17 MR. KREBS: Yes. 18 MS. HAGGERTY: -- we won twenty of 19 them. 20 MR. KREBS: Okay. You -- you --21 you --22 MS. HAGGERTY: And other people won 23 the other eighty. 24 MR. KREBS: Who were your principal 25 sellers of pools?

ĺ	Page 47
1	FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010
2	MS. HAGGERTY: And again, would you
3	like to focus specifically on subprime
4	MR. KREBS: Yeah, subprime.
5	MS. HAGGERTY: or just across the
6	board. I'm sorry
7	MR. KREBS: Let's just deal with
8	subprime now.
9	MS. HAGGERTY: Okay, I'm sorry. I
10	keep
11	MR. KREBS: That's all right.
12	MS. HAGGERTY: talking in
13	general.
14	Subprime.
15	MR. KREBS: And then we'll come
16	back.
17	MS. HAGGERTY: We bought a product
18	from Encore, People's Choice,
19	MortgageIT
20	MR. KREBS: I'm sorry. That was
21	what?
22	MS. HAGGERTY: MortgageIT,
23	Ameriquest, from time to time, New
24	Century. Those are some of the names
25	that come to mind.

Page 48 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MR. KREBS: Wells Fargo Home 3 Mortgage? 4 MS. HAGGERTY: Wells Fargo was a big 5 customer of the firm on the jumbo and Alt-A side, and so we would have bid 6 7 their product if they presented subprime 8 to us, yes. I don't recall how much we 9 bought of subprime from them. 10 MR. KREBS: Quick Loan Funding? 11 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 12 MR. KREBS: Impac --13 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 14 MR. KREBS: -- Impac Funding? 15 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 16 MR. BORGERS: Fremont Investment & 17 Loan? 18 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes, we bought from 19 Fremont. 20 MR. KREBS: Comm Unity Linden 21 Associates (ph.)? 22 MS. HAGGERTY: Comm Unity rings a 23 bell, yes. Whether that was specifically 24 subprime or not --25 MR. KREBS: (Indiscernible) number

	Page 49
1	FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010
2	
3	MS. HAGGERTY: not sure.
4	MR. KREBS: What I'm showing to you
5	is a document again, trending reports
6	generated by Clayton. Have you seen
7	these documents before? Trending
8	reports.
9	MS. HAGGERTY: I don't recall this
10	document, no.
11	MR. KREBS: Was there a point in
12	time where the Clayton folks came to and
13	met with Bear Stearns to discuss the
14	trending reports, that you're aware of?
15	MS. HAGGERTY: I don't know.
16	MR. KREBS: If they had come to Bear
17	Stearns to discuss the impact or the
18	findings of this trending report, who
19	
20	
21	likely they would've met with John
22	
23	
2 4	for the due diligence side?
25	MS. HAGGERTY: Yes.

Page 50 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 MR. KREBS: And he was -- where was 3 John in the organizational chart with 4 respect to your position? 5 MS. HAGGERTY: John worked in the 6 mortgage finance department, of which I 7 was co-head. So he reported up to me. 8 MR. KREBS: Were you ever made aware 9 of a meeting between Clayton and any 10 person in your operation to discuss the 11 trending reports of Clayton Brokerage? 12 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't recall. 13 MR. KREBS: All right. Let me ask 14 you to look at the second page of this 15 document. 16 MS. CAREY: Tom --17 MR. KREBS: Yeah. 18 MS. CAREY: We were talking before 19 about, in the context of subprime --20 MR. KREBS: Yes. 21 MS. CAREY: -- it's unclear here 22 whether this has anything to do with 23 (indiscernible) --24 MR. KREBS: I think this is subprime 25 as well, but I cannot represent that to

Page 51 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 you. I -- I do not know whether this is 2 exclusively subprime. I do believe that 3 it -- it is based on all of the due 4 diligence done by Clayton and it is a 5 document that would have been triggered 6 by the generation of this document. 7 My -- that's my understanding. 8 You see the waivers here? It says 9 that "Bear Stearns overall waiver rate 10 seven percent compared to Clayton 11 industry average of eleven percent for 12 all summary reviews performed by all 13 clients for the same period"? 14 Um-hum. Yes. MS. HAGGERTY: 15 MR. KREBS: Did you see this, where 16 the highest waiver rate among the top 17 five sellers was found on Encore reviews, 18 while the lowest was found on Fieldstone. 19 Have you ever dealt with Fieldstone, to 20 your knowledge? 21 MS. HAGGERTY: Fieldstone was a 22

seller to EMC, I believe. I know that EMC bid their product.

MR. KREBS: Says that the most

23

24

Page 52 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 commonly waived exceptions for Encore 3 were "MA borrower interest outside safe 4 harbor, not client approved". Do you know what that means? MS. HAGGERTY: I don't. It's 6 7 ringing a bell. MA, I believe, stands 8 for Mass --9 MR. KREBS: You're -- you're a lot 10 more likely to know what it means than I 11 am, I'll tell you, at this point. 12 MS. HAGGERTY: MA, I believe, stands 13 for Massachusetts. 14 MR. KREBS: Uh-huh. 15 MS. HAGGERTY: And the bell that 16 it's ringing is somewhere along the 17 line -- states came up with their own 18 individual high-cost lending rules in 19 addition to the national HOEPA 20 requirements. So I recall that there was 21 something in Massachusetts. 22 And "interest outside safe harbor, 23 not client approved" must refer to that. 24 And my recollection is it wasn't clear 25 what the risk of nonenforcement was, if

Page 53 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 you will. So that could be what that 2 was. 3 I'm very shaky on the details, but 4 I'm just offering you what I think it 5 could be. 6 MR. KREBS: With respect to a loan 7 that was, say, questionable -- wasn't 8 exactly in the parameters of a reject and 9 it wasn't exactly an acceptable loan --10 what were the factors that you might have 11 considered -- or Bear Stearns at that 12 time considered in connection with 13 approving or rejecting those loans? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. One -- to that 15 point --16 MR. KREBS: Sure. 17 MS. HAGGERTY: -- what we just 18 looked at with Massachusetts --19 MR. KREBS: Uh-huh. 20 MS. HAGGERTY: -- is a compliance 21 22 point. MR. KREBS: Right. 23 MS. HAGGERTY: The compliance points 24 tended to be pretty cut and dry --25

Page 54 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 MR. KREBS: You can't -- you can't 2 3 waive those. MS. HAGGERTY: It is or it isn't --MR. KREBS: Yeah. 5 6 MS. HAGGERTY: Right. So the 7 compensating factor analysis, that you 8 talked about --9 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 10 MS. HAGGERTY: -- before, with the 11 2, would be on the credit side. And so 12 if Clayton coded something as a 2, they 13 thought there was a compensating factor. 14 That could be something like the maximum 15 loan-to-value ratio for the program is 16 seventy-five percent; the originator made 17 the loan at eighty percent; but the 18 compensating factor is that the homeowner has 100,000 dollars in the bank. 19 20 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 21 MS. HAGGERTY: So that's the type of 22 thing that would be evaluated. 23 MR. KREBS: Who is it that would 24 have made the decision to accept or 25 reject that loan, based on those

	Page 55
1	FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010
2	circumstances you just described?
3	MS. HAGGERTY: Well, Clayton came up
4	with the 2s
5	MR. KREBS: Um-hum.
6	MS. HAGGERTY: so they made the
7	decision that there was enough of a
8	compensating factor in the file to call
9	it a two.
10	MR. KREBS: Based on what they had
11	been given and what they understood the
12	underwriting guidelines were?
13	MS. HAGGERTY: Correct. Correct.
1.4	MR. KREBS: All right. What happens
15	when the 3s come up, the waivers?
16	MS. HAGGERTY: Well, again, waiver
17	is is something I'm not familiar
18	with that term in in how we did things
19	at Bear.
20	What would typically happen with 3s
21	is that the due diligence firm should
22	present them to the seller, because
23	sometimes 3s occur just because
24	documentation is missing.
25	The other thing that we would always

Page 56

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

want to make sure is that Clayton -- the

Clayton reviewer wasn't missing something
in the file. So it was typical to give
the seller the opportunity to look at the
3s and see if they could provide
additional information or point out a

compensating factor, let's say, to -- to
show the Clayton lead that this is not a
3; it's a 2 or it's a 1.

MR. KREBS: Well, in point of fact, Clayton did have a 2T, which was a -- to give somebody the opportunity to bring in documents that were missing from the file. That -- so that wouldn't have counted as in the 2Ws that they were pushing out.

If you look at the bottom here,

"exception-level waivers". It says by

far, the most common waiver exception

laws, "loan characteristics do not match

any available program. With 681 waivers,

representing eleven percent of all waived

exceptions".

Do you know what "that loan

Page 57 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 characteristics do not match any 2 available program" might have been? 3 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't. But what I would say is, what it could be is -- what 5 would come to mind would be an example 6 like I just gave, the loan-to-value 7 ratio --8 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 9 MS. HAGGERTY: -- is outside of the 10 parameters and it became an acceptable 11 12 risk --MR. KREBS: Well if you look at the 13 next one --14 MS. HAGGERTY: -- to whomever was 15 evaluating it. 16 MR. KREBS: -- the -- the next one 17 is actually the one that I'm concerned 18 about. The most common waived exception 19 in 2007 reviews was "stated income not 20 reasonable". 21 How is it that you came -- those 22 waivers were affected? What compensating 23 factors were there that would make income 24 that appeared not reasonable to become 25

Page 58

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 reasonable? Or other compensating factors.

And you may not know the answer to that; this is not a cross-examination. I really don't know the answer to it; I'm just trying to get the data.

MS. HAGGERTY: Yeah, understood.

And -- and I think that in the case of "stated income not reasonable" and, in fact, I think the case of all the exceptions, it's very much facts and circumstances of the individual files.

So, for example --

MR. KREBS: Yes.

MS. HAGGERTY: -- it could be a couple of things.

One thing could be that -- let's say, for example, the stated income resulted in a debt-to-income ratio of twenty-five percent and Clayton says that stated income is not reasonable. But an income that was reasonable resulted in a debt-to-income ratio of forty percent, which was still within the acceptable

Page 59 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 debt-to-income guidelines. That could be 2 a reason that you would waive the Clayton 3 finding. Again, just an example --4 MR. KREBS: Sure. 5 MS. HAGGERTY: -- as a possibility. 6 Not saying that's what happened --7 MR. KREBS: And again --8 MS. HAGGERTY: -- possibility. 9 MR. KREBS: -- the two people who 10 would have been making those decisions 11 are John and Pattie? 12 MS. HAGGERTY: Pattie, correct. 13 MR. KREBS: Yeah. 14 MS. HAGGERTY: That's correct. 15 I think the other possibility that 16 something might get waived is a 17 difference of opinion between the Clayton 18 reviewer as to the reasonableness of 19 stated income, and John or Pattie. 20 That's another possibility. 21 MR. KREBS: And -- and those 22 concerns would have been transmitted to 23 John or -- or Pattie on a daily basis 24 from the Clayton due diligence site? 25

Page 60 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MS. HAGGERTY: You know, I think it varied. I think, very frankly, Pattie 3 was more of a daily keep-up-with-it and 4 John kind of looked at stuff at the end. 5 6 But I think it -- I think it varied from 7 transaction to transaction. MR. KREBS: Was this essentially the 8 9 same process, albeit with different 10 underwriting standards that were employed 11 in other loan origination or acquisition 12 of loans by Bear Stearns for the example 13 of family -- one-to-four families? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: For bulk purchases? 15 MR. KREBS: Yeah. 16 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes, this was 17 typically the way it went, I note, as a 18 very general matter. 19 MR. KREBS: But you feel quite 20 certain that Bear, with respect to 21 subprime, did a due diligence review on a 22 hundred percent of its loans? 23 MS. HAGGERTY: When we were the 24 purchaser? 25 MR. KREBS: Yes.

Page 61 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: When EMC was the 2 purchaser, yes. There may have been a 3 situation where we did less. And that, 4 again, would have been transaction-5 specific, but my recollection is that we 6 typically did a hundred percent on the 7 loans we purchased from third parties. 8 MR. KREBS: That's a -- that's a 9 mystery to me. All right. 10 MR. BORGERS: I did have a question 11 about the due diligence on the -- who 12 developed the policy for the due 13 diligence area? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: The policy for the 15 due diligence area was developed by John 16 and Pattie and Baron and myself, along 17 with in-house counsel at the time. 18 MR. BORGERS: Okay. 19 MR. KREBS: I'm just showing you 20 what we'll probably mark as Exhibit 4. 21 If you read the first paragraph here, it 22 says, "critical lead" -- and that 23

Clayton -- "to call Bear due diligence

presumably means the lead person at

24

Page 62

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

manager on first morning of job. Leave

message, leave callback number and/or

cell number. If you're not aware which

contact you should call, contact Greg

Quinlan" (ph.) -- or somebody -- "this is

mandatory".

So it looks like, with respect to the due diligence performed by Clayton, that they were under instructions at the commencement of the due diligence process to be in touch with people at Bear.

MS. HAGGERTY: Makes sense, yes.

MR. KREBS: You'll see the first bullet point says "please send in the data every night so that we may run the daily reports early the next morning".

What is a daily report? Do you know?

MS. HAGGERTY: That would have been internal to Clayton, I believe.

MR. KREBS: You don't know whether those daily reports were provided to Bear?

MS. HAGGERTY: I don't. You know, a certain element of what has to occur here

Page 63 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 is just managing the nuts and bolts of 2 getting through the work --3 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 4 MS. HAGGERTY: -- and keeping the 5 transaction -- or the work done on 6 schedule. So that may have been what 7 that was about. 8 MR. KREBS: If you look at the third 9 bullet point here, it indicates that the 10 bid stips override all guidelines and 11 must be followed closely. And that --12 you've spoken about what bid stips were 13 earlier, right? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. Yes. 15 MR. KREBS: We'll come back to that 16 document in a little bit. 17 I think we're on what, Exhibit 6? 18 MS. CAREY: 5, I think. 19 MR. KREBS: 5? 20 5. MR. CUNICELLI: 21 MR. KREBS: You -- this is not a 22 document created by Bear. It's a 23 document created by Clayton, but it shows 24 that in 2005, with respect to revenue, 25

Page 64 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 Bear was pretty high up on the list. As a matter of fact, it was second, only 3 behind Morgan Stanley. 5 But in 2006 and 2007, in terms of 6 the revenue generated -- that is, 7 presumably the revenue provided to 8 Clayton -- it fell behind just a little 9 bit, so that, if you look at loan volumes 10 on the line below it, well, Bear is --11 was doing, in 2005, 132,000; in 2006, 12 61,000; and in 2007, 24,000. Does that 13 seem to be about right to you? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: As I sit here right 15 now, I don't know. It certainly seems 16 plausible. 17 Then again, these would be the loan volumes that Clayton reviewed? 18 19 MR. KREBS: Yes. 20 MS. HAGGERTY: Yeah. 21 MR. KREBS: Clayton reviewed. 22 is correct. 23 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. Yeah. 24 MR. KREBS: I mean these are all 25 built off of the Clayton data.

Page 65 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: So not necessarily 2 the volume of loans that Bear Stearns or 3 EMC bought or securitized; these would be the ones that Clayton reviewed --5 MR. KREBS: These are --6 MS. HAGGERTY: -- across all product 7 types? 8 MR. KREBS: Yes --9 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. 10 MR. KREBS: -- that -- that is 11 correct. Now --12 MS. HAGGERTY: Okay. 13 MR. KREBS: -- did -- were there 14 loans reviewed by Clayton, to your 15 knowledge, that were not subsequently 16 securitized and -- or purchased by Bear? 17 MS. HAGGERTY: If Clayton reviewed 18 loans in a bulk purchase and Bear 19 rejected them and didn't buy them, yes. 20 MR. KREBS: Didn't buy the whole 21 pool -- or the --22 MS. HAGGERTY: Or didn't --23 MR. KREBS: -- or loans within the 24 pool? 25

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

MS. HAGGERTY: -- or didn't buy the rejects within the pool.

There may have been instances where Bear didn't buy the pool at all. And there would also be instances where Clayton may have been used to do an underwriter's due diligence sample, where we didn't buy the loans, but they reviewed loans that were in deals that Bear was just the underwriter for.

MR. KREBS: I understand.

MS. HAGGERTY: So that could be part

MS. HAGGERTY: So that could be part of these -- should be part of these numbers, too.

MR. KREBS: In -- in those instances, how many of the loans -- what percentage of the loans would have been subjected to due diligence?

MS. HAGGERTY: I think it varied by the product type of the -- the third party issuer. But a typical rule of thumb would have been ten percent --

MR. KREBS: Ten percent?

MS. HAGGERTY: -- of the pool.

Page 67 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 Typical. 2 MR. KREBS: And -- but with respect 3 to those loans that Bear purchased, 4 brought in its own inventory and 5 subsequently packaged and securitized 6 under its own -- or a variety of names, 7 they did a hundred percent of the due 8 diligence on those, do you think? 9 MS. HAGGERTY: For subprime. 10 MR. KREBS: Okay. 11 We'll take a little break. 12 MS. HAGGERTY: Sure. 13 MR. KREBS: And then we'll pick up 14 here in a couple of minutes, if that's 15 all right. 16 Thank you. 17 (Break) 18 MR. CUNICELLI: All right. I've got 19 12:13, we're back on record. 20 MR. KREBS: Do you have any notion 21 as to what time that Bear Stearns ceased 22 its operations in connection with 23 performing due diligence for Bear Res? 24 And I'll tell you why I'm asking the 25

Page 68 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 question. I'm trying to determine 2 3 whether or not the 72,000 loans are involved in the figures we have here from 5 Clayton. Would it have been before the 6 first quarter of 2006, before Bear Res 7 was up and operational and was put in --8 doing its own internal due diligence? 9 MS. HAGGERTY: I think that's 10 possible, yes, because they started 11 making loans in April or May of '05 --12 MR. KREBS: Okay. 13 MS. HAGGERTY: -- so that sounds about right. Again, without certainty, 14 15 but it sounds reasonable. 16 MR. KREBS: What other 17 methodologies -- the purchase of -- of 18 bulk loans, the Bear Res generating 19 loans --20 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. 21 MR. KREBS: -- what other 22 methodologies, if any, did Bear Stearns 23 employ for the acquisition of loans, 24 mortgage loans, for its securitization 25 desk?

Page 69

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

MS. HAGGERTY: Bear Stearns had -or EMC had a channel that we called the
flow conduit. And that was an operation
that was located in Lewisville, Texas
within the EMC Servicing operation. And
that operation reported up to the head of
EMC Servicing.

MR. KREBS: Well, describe to me the flow conduit.

MS. HAGGERTY: Flow conduit was a situation where an originator would be approved to sell loans to the flow conduit. And once approved to sell, that originator would get a daily pricing sheet.

Every day, for a certain period of time -- call it 9 to 4, or something like that -- the originator could then sell loans to EMC by calling up the commitment desk and registering the loans at a price for delivery in thirty days or forty-five days or sixty days out. On --

MR. KREBS: Let -- let me stop for a -- Tom, are you still here?

Page 70 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MR. BORGERS: Yes. 3 MR. KREBS: All right, sorry. I apologize. 5 MS. HAGGERTY: So unlike bulk --6 with bulk, the originator offered their 7 package of loans out to a number of 8 investors and Bear Stearns or EMC could 9 choose to bid them or not bid them. MR. KREBS: Yes. 10 11 MS. HAGGERTY: But for flow, as long 12 as that originator was approved and in 13 good standing, they could sell, trade, 14 all day long, based on the prices that 15 were outlined on the rate sheet --16 MR. KREBS: What were --17 MS. HAGGERTY: -- the pricing sheet. 18 MR. KREBS: In addition to the 19 pricing sheet, were these people who 20 could sell loans to the conduit, the flow 21 conduit, were they also provided with 22 minimum standards or due diligence or 23 underwriting standards? 24 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. Each flow 25 seller entered into a mortgage loan

Page 71

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

purchase agreement. That mortgage loan

purchase agreement, over time, changed to

reference a seller guide. The seller

guide contained information about how to

register; how to deliver loans; in

general, what the process for reviewing

loans would be at EMC's operation; in

general, how the settlement process would

work; and it included underwriting

guidelines.

The sellers also had the option to submit their own underwriting guidelines for approval. And this is what I described earlier, where staff at the EMC flow conduit would review that seller's own guidelines against EMC's --

MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

MS. HAGGERTY: -- and approve the seller's guidelines, with certain restrictions.

MR. KREBS: But the due diligence was performed at the flow conduit level?

MS. HAGGERTY: Yes, it was performed by employees of EMC. That's correct.

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

MR. KREBS: Were those loans -- or any other loans, whether acquired through the flow conduit or through the bulk loan purchases -- were they ever reunderwritten? Was there another procedure that they had to go through or was this the -- the procedure, the -- the due diligence side of the procedure?

MS. HAGGERTY: The due diligence review was the procedure that we went through in order to buy the loans, yes.

In addition to that, there was a quality control review that was done on a sample of the loans. And that was done after the loans were purchased by EMC.

MR. KREBS: Again, that was an inhouse review?

MS. HAGGERTY: Yes, although an outsourcer was used to perform some of it. And the name of that company was Advitech, A-D-V-I-T-E-K -- C-H, I believe.

MR. KREBS: So we have loans purchased in bulk, loans generated by

Page 73 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 Bear Res and the flow conduit. Were 2 there any other methodologies employed at 3 Bear Stearns for the acquisition of 4 mortgages that were ultimately to be 5 securitized? 6 MS. HAGGERTY: In 2007 -- February 7 of 2007, Bear Res completed its 8 acquisition of certain of the assets of 9 Encore Credit. 10 MR. KREBS: Not really good timing, 11 I'm sorry, that -- everybody in was it? 12 the room knows that now, I'm sure. 13 But -- and that was February of 2007? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: Correct. 15 MR. KREBS: Were those loans -- did 16 they appear in -- how -- how were the 17 loans generated by Encore Credit 18 evaluated for purposes of meeting the 19 guidelines? Were they subjected to due 20 diligence as well? 21 MS. HAGGERTY: Prior to the 22 settlement of the asset purchase, they 23 were subjected to due diligence, yes. 24 And after that, I don't recall exactly 25

Page 74 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 what we did. MR. KREBS: Going back to the flow conduit and the acknowledgment and the underwriting guidelines contained in the seller guide. Were there also warranties and representations regarding having complied with the underwriting guidelines by those persons who were providing loans pursuant to the flow conduit? MS. HAGGERTY: The mortgage loan purchase agreement had many, many reps and warranties. And, to the best of my recollection, there was one that said the loans are underwritten in accordance with the agreed-upon guidelines. MR. KREBS: Was due diligence

MR. KREBS: Was due diligence undertaken to determine whether to put back those loans or some of those loans?

 ${\tt MS}$  . HAGGERTY: The quality control review that I spoke about --

MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

MS. HAGGERTY: -- that occurs postclosing -- if the quality control review showed a breach of the representation and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 75 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 warranty --2 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 3 MS. HAGGERTY: -- and that breach 4 had a material and adverse effect on the 5 loan, then the loan was to be put back to 6 the originator. That was the standard in 7 the mortgage loan purchase agreement; the 8 breach had to have a material and adverse 9 effect on the loan. 10 MR. KREBS: Was -- was that term 11 also employed in connection with the bulk 12 purchases? "Material and 13 adverse" --14 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 15 MR. KREBS: -- "effect". 16 MS. HAGGERTY: Um-hum. 17 MR. KREBS: Did Bear Stearns utilize 18 any warehouse lending for the acquisition 19 of mortgage loans? 20 MS. HAGGERTY: Bear Stearns had two 21 warehouse facilities. One was operated 22 under a company called Bear Stearns 23 Mortgage Capital Corporation and the 24 other was operated under a company called 25

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 EMC Residential Mortgage Corporation.

The Bear Stearns Mortgage Capital Corporation lines were to larger originators, and they were what was commonly referred to as aggregation lines.

So, for example, a line may have been extended to People's Choice such that People's Choice could use that line to make loans until they had enough critical mass to do a securitization.

That was the general idea for that warehouse business.

The one at EMC Residential was about twenty or twenty-five customers. And those, with an aggregate, at the largest, of about 5- or 600 million in outstandings --

MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

MS. HAGGERTY: -- and the purpose of that line was to make warehouse funds available to smaller sellers who were then going to sell whole loans to end investors.

Page 77 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 So two different business lines 2 within the firm. 3 MR. KREBS: Under either line, were 4 they -- were the recipients of the 5 warehouse loaning facility obligated to 6 sell their -- or to offer their loans to 7 Bear Stearns or were they free to offer 8 them to anybody on the street? 9 MS. HAGGERTY: They were free to 10 offer them to anybody on the street. 11 MR. KREBS: To the extent that they 12 were offered to Bear Stearns, were they 13 also subjected to due diligence as we've 14 discussed with respect to bulk purchases? 15 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. Or to the flow 16 conduit --17 MR. KREBS: Yes. 18 MS. HAGGERTY: -- due diligence, 19 depending on which channel they selected. 20 MR. KREBS: Explain that to me. How 21 were they given an option as to which 22 channel they could select? 23 I'm -- I'm -- you've just taken a 24 right turn and I didn't follow you --25

Page 78 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 MS. HAGGERTY: Okav. 3 MR. KREBS: -- tell me. MS. HAGGERTY: This would relate to 5 the EMC Residential warehouse line --6 MR. KREBS: Uh-huh. 7 MS. HAGGERTY: So if I am a seller 8 that has a warehouse line with EMC 9 Residential, I may be allowed to sell 10 bulk and I may also be signed up to sell 11 And the decision for an originator 12 to sell bulk or flow is really based on 13 their own risk appetite to take interest 14 rate risk. 15 MR. KREBS: Um-hum. 16 MS. HAGGERTY: So for flow, if I 17 make a -- a commitment to you, as a 18 homeowner, to sell you -- to do a loan 19 for you at five percent, the safest thing 20 for me to do that same exact day is to 21 sell your loan forward to somebody else. 22 So then I'm matched and I don't have any 23 risk. And that's called a best efforts 24 commitment. 25 MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

Page 79 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: If you don't close 2 with me, I don't have to deliver it out. 3 So for an originator, the safest thing to 4 do is to sell flow. 5 As the market heated up during that 6 time period, some originators chose to 7 bulk up and take some of that interest 8 rate risk to get more proceeds. 9 MR. BORGERS: I -- I have a question 10 about Encore Credit. Was that a -- which 11 side of the fence did they receive a 12 warehouse line, or could they receive it 13 under both the Bear Stearns and EMC? 14 MS. HAGGERTY: Encore's warehouse 15 line was Bear Stearns Mortgage Capital 16 Corporation. 17 MR. BORGERS: And do you know how 18 large of a facility that was? 19 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't recall, no. 20 MR. KREBS: During your tenure at 21 Bear Stearns, were there -- did there 22 come a point in time when you elected not 23 to deal with a particular loan 24 originator? 25

Page 80 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 3 MR. KREBS: Who was that? 4 MS. HAGGERTY: There were a number 5 of them. People's Choice would have been 6 one. 7 MR. KREBS: People's Choice? 8 MS. HAGGERTY: Yes. 9 There was a group within the EMC 10 operation that was responsible for 11 monitoring sellers and they would make 12 the recommendations to stop doing 13 business. So there were -- there were 14 quite a few. 15 What would happen first is we may 16 say -- or look at the performance and 17 say -- and this I recall in 2006 -- your 18 performance for a hundred percent LTV 19 product is not good; you can't sell us a 20 hundred percent LTV product anymore. 21 That happened with a company called 22 Entrust Mortgage. 23 MR. KREBS: Entrust? 24 MS. HAGGERTY: E-N-T-R-U-S-T, yeah. 25 And then in early 2007, there were

Page 81 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 quite a few originators who were -- the 2 business relationship was terminated 3 because their capital levels fell below 4 the requirement. 5 MR. KREBS: Why would you have 6 capital levels with the loan originators? 7 To ensure that they had the ability to 8 buy them back when you went back to them? 9 MS. HAGGERTY: The capital levels 10 weren't that high; they were typically a 11 million dollars' tangible net worth. 12 that was part of the reason, yes. 13 think that it was a delegated 14 underwriting program. So that was a 15 typical industry standard of capital 16 levels for delegated underwriting. 17 MR. KREBS: What were some of the 18 other requirements of that program in 19 addition to the capital requirements? 20 MS. HAGGERTY: As part of the 21 approval process, when a new seller 22 presented themselves, there was an 23 application that was filled out --24 MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

MS. HAGGERTY: -- which gave the level of experience of the principals and the chief officers. One of the other requirements was that the originator be a HUD-approved mortgagee. Typically, the originators would have experience with mortgage insurance, although not always, because certainly, in subprime, there was no mortgage insurance. The originators had to have a warehouse line, they had to be mortgage bankers. And I believe that we typically looked for, you know, some sort of track record, either in the current company or with the principals in prior companies.

In addition, references would be called, which would be, typically, other investors, the warehouse banks --

MR. KREBS: By "other investors", you mean other investment banks?

MS. HAGGERTY: Yes.

MR. KREBS: People who had done business with them purchasing their product?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 83 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: Correct. 2 MR. KREBS: All right. I'm sorry, I 3 didn't mean to interrupt you. 4 That's okay. MS. HAGGERTY: 5 MR. KREBS: Well, I did mean to 6 interrupt you. But --7 MS. HAGGERTY: And mortgage 8 insurance companies. 9 MR. KREBS: Okay. 10 MS. HAGGERTY: Quality control 11 policies would be submitted and reviewed, 12 the underwriting guidelines would be 1.3 submitted and reviewed, and, typically, 14 that approval group would hold a 15 conference call with the operational 16 people to just discuss how loans are 17 originated, closed and funded, and then 18 just talk about logistical items with 19 respect to delivery of the files and then 20 the transfer of servicing from the 21 originator to EMC in connection with the 22 purchase. 23 MR. KREBS: When -- when Clayton 24 departed Bear Res, we think sometime in, 25

Page 84 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 maybe, 2005, probably before the first 3 quarter of 2006, how many personnel did 4 you have devoted to underwriting in that 5 operation? Do you know? 6 MS. HAGGERTY: At Bear Res --7 MR. KREBS: Yeah. MS. HAGGERTY: I don't recall. 8 9 MR. KREBS: Yeah. What about at your flow lines? How many folks did you 10 have there dedicated to underwriting and 11 12 due diligence? 13 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't remember 14 exactly, but order of magnitude for that 15 whole operation, which would include flow 16 underwriters, maybe like eight people on 17 the commitment desk and then people that 18 would do funding reviews. Order of 19 magnitude, around 120 people. 20 MR. KREBS: How many of the --21 MS. HAGGERTY: And, again -- I'm 22 sorry, that's for all the products --23 MR. KREBS: For all --24 MS. HAGGERTY: -- not just subprime. 25 MR. KREBS: I understand.

Page 85 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 MS. HAGGERTY: For all the products. 2 MR. KREBS: Tell us the types of 3 products, other than subprime, that you 4 engaged in the purchase of mortgages. 5 MS. HAGGERTY: In the flow conduit, 6 there was very little subprime that came 7 through the flow conduit. So it was 8 chiefly the Alt-A product. Adjustable 9 rate and fixed rate Alt-A products. 10 MR. KREBS: I'm going to ask you a 11 question that has been dogging me since I 12 started this project. What's the 13 difference -- how do you know the 14 difference between -- when does Alt-A 15 become subprime? 16 MS. HAGGERTY: I think that in your 17 travels, you'll probably get a lot of 18 different nuances. And --19 MR. KREBS: Oh, believe me, I have. 20 MS. HAGGERTY: -- answers. So I'll 21 tell you what it meant to me and what it 22 meant to us at Bear. 23 A couple of things. Some of the big 24 picture ones were, first of all, subprime 25

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

would be loan-to-value ratios over eighty
percent with no mortgage insurance.

That's a very large differentiator. If

it was an Alt-A loan and the loan-to
value ratio was over eighty percent, you
required mortgage insurance in most
cases.

The second thing that differentiated subprime was the originator. And by that, I mean that when the originator went to the marketplace to originate the loans, they marketed a subprime program. So if the originator was a retail originator that employed loan officers to talk to homeowners or they were a wholesaler that employed account executives to go call on brokers, they were marketing a subprime product.

Another major differentiator between subprime and Alt-A was just how the rate sheet is constructed. Alt-A rate sheet starts with a base interest rate with a price associated with it. And then you have a lot of different attributes that

impact that base rate, like is it a second home or an investment property or a primary residence. Each of those, at the primary being the base rate, but if it's a second or investor, you might change the price, which, in turn, affects the interest rate. So Alt-A was categorized -- characterized by a lot of these -- risk-based pricing is what we called all these different attributes.

Typically, and this did change over time, but the combined loan-to-value ratio -- you didn't see first and seconds in subprime as prevalently as you saw in Alt-A; it was unusual to see a first and second piggyback in subprime. Subprime was very much that, on the adjustable rate side, that 2/28 and 3/27 product, you didn't see that in Alt-A. For Alt-A the -- the ARMs would be a 3.6 LIBOR, a 5.6 LIBOR, 7 and 10.

Typically, the loan amounts, just on average, tended to be smaller with subprime. But, again, the big

Page 88 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 differentiator for me would be the 3 originator was offering a subprime 4 product. 5 MR. KREBS: And what he called it, 6 you called it? 7 MS. HAGGERTY: Well, it had these 8 other attributes. 9 MR. KREBS: Sure. 10 MS. HAGGERTY: And -- and, you know, 11 it was very much a way of -- of how the 12 loans were -- were priced and marketed. 13 Again, you know, this notion of the --14 all the price adjustments on Alt-A, which 15 it didn't have that same kind of 16 granularity in subprime. 17 MR. KREBS: So you acquire a company 18 in February of 2007. How long had it 19 been operating prior to the acquisition? 20 MS. HAGGERTY: I'm not a hundred 21 percent sure, but I believe it was 22 several years. I want to say '04-ish. 23 Could have been before that, could have 24 been after that. 25 MR. KREBS: So you've got a pipeline

Page 89 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 of mortgages ready for -- to be 2 securitized and then, all of a sudden, 3 the market disappears. What happens to 4 those mortgages that could not be 5 securitized? 6 MS. HAGGERTY: Mortgages that can't 7 be securitized remain with the owner of 8 them. 9 MR. KREBS: Do you have a notion as 10 to how many of those were on Bear 11 Stearns' books, say, September of '07? 12 MS. HAGGERTY: I don't, as I sit 13 here today. 14 MR. KREBS: Was there a point in 15 time where you saw the market turn, where 16 you knew there was no longer a market in 17 the securitization for RMBS, mortgage-18 backed securities? 19 MS. HAGGERTY: I think that the --20 the team at Bear Stearns, yes, saw that. 21 I mean the team at Bear Stearns was 22 talking to the investor base daily and --23 and certainly saw that. 24 MR. KREBS: When was that? 25

Page 90 1 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 2 MS. HAGGERTY: Some time throughout 2007. I -- I can't tell you with --3 MR. KREBS: Before --5 MS. HAGGERTY: -- specificity. 6 MR. KREBS: -- BSAM crashed on 7/31 7 of '07? 8 MS. HAGGERTY: There was a lot of 9 activity in the market -- or -- I don't know if volatility's the right word, but 10 11 there was a lot happening in March, 12 April, May in general in the Alt-A 13 markets. So as I sit here today, exactly 14 what happened -- what happened when, I 15 can't tell you. 16 MR. KREBS: Do you have a -- a 17 knowledge of how much or how often Bear 18 Stearns was going to the market with RMBS 19 or mortgage-backed securities during that 20 time frame? Had it resulted in a trickle 21 of offerings or was it a number of them 22 attempted to get ready to -- to move? 23 What -- what happened during that period 24 of time when it was all this volatility 25 in the market with respect to the

Page 91 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 securitizations? 2 I don't want to MS. HAGGERTY: 3 answer because I don't remember exactly. 4 I'm sorry. 5 MR. KREBS: Is it fair to say that 6 there came a point in time in 2007 when 7 you realized this deal is over? 8 MS. HAGGERTY: Well, it was 9 certainly the volume started to come down 10 and there was less demand. Yes, that 11 occurred during that springtime into the 12 summer, yes. 13 MR. KREBS: With respect to that 14 springtime and summer, what did you do --15 you and -- and -- with the loans that had 16 been -- or then being originated at Bear 17 Res and your new acquired company and 18 your flow channels, what were you doing 19 with those? 20 MS. HAGGERTY: One thing that we 21 were doing during that time period is 22 reducing the number that we bought. And 23 during that time period, we were also 24 reducing the types of loans that we 25

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 bought. Meaning, I believe, sometime during those time periods, we stopped buying the no income verification loans and the no ratio loans. At some point during that time period, we stopped buying the negative amortization loans. Again, I can't tell you exactly what products when, but there was a lot of activity with respect to reducing the -- the variety of the offering.

MR. KREBS: You just used a term that I -- I'm not familiar with. Maybe my colleagues are. No ratio loans, what does that mean?

MS. HAGGERTY: No ratio is a -- a documentation type description, like full doc or stated income or -- or no documentation. And they -- you would typically, in a no ratio, verified asset, verify liquid assets, but you would not only not verify income, you would not require the borrower to state the income. And because they're not stating the income, you can't calculate a debt-to-

Page 93 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 income ratio. So hence the name. 2 MR. KREBS: When did those loans 3 come into being? 4 MS. HAGGERTY: I -- I don't remember 5 exactly when. Somewhere --6 MR. KREBS: Presumably sometime 7 before. 8 MS. HAGGERTY: -- in that period --9 that time period, the '03 to '07 time 10 Somewhere along that line. period. 11 MR. KREBS: Was it -- did there come 12 a point in time at Bear Stearns where, 13 following the volatility in the market, 14 following the fact that we want to cut 15 back on our purchases, that we began to 16 intensify our efforts to put loans back 17 to originators? 18 MS. HAGGERTY: There was a group at 19 EMC whose job it was to put loans back to 20 originators. Loans went back to 21 originators for two reasons. 22 The first reason was in the mortgage 23 loan purchase agreement between EMC and 24 the sellers, it was -- typically, the 25

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 sellers made a covenant that if one of the first, second or third payments due to EMC after the loan was sold to EMC became delinquent, EMC had the right to put that loan back to the originator.

Sometimes they did and sometimes they didn't.

A reason that they wouldn't would typically be if the delinquency was caused by some sort of servicing transfer confusion on the part of the borrower that then righted itself. So the borrower sent the payment to the old mortgage company, they should have sent it to EMC, the old mortgage company forwards it to EMC, gets there late, it shows as a delinquency; those types of things, EMC would typically not put back to the originator.

MR. KREBS: Um-hum.

MS. HAGGERTY: But if it was, you know, a true default, EMC would seek to do that.

The second reason that EMC would put

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 a loan back to an originator is if they had done a quality control review and found a breach of a rep and warranty that materially and adversely impacted the loan. And that would be a basis for putting the loan back.

MR. KREBS: What were the common breaches of reps and warranties that were experienced during this period of time?

MS. HAGGERTY: Let's see.

I think what -- what one would typically see would be things like the appraised value of the property was misstated. It could be that the borrower represented that they were going to be the primary residence and it was, in fact, an investor property, it was discovered.

Another thing that occurred over time was that the borrowers would not disclose all their debts. So what we would see, from time to time, was a borrower might buy five properties on the same day --

Page 96 FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 1 2 MR. KREBS: Yeah. 3 MS. HAGGERTY: -- get them financed by five different lenders and not tell 4 5 each other that they had all this 6 indebtedness. 7 So those would be the type of things 8 that you could discover later. 9 MR. KREBS: Presumably, you're not 10 buying all five of those loans. 11 MS. HAGGERTY: Correct. You're not. 12 MR. KREBS: You're -- you're buying 13 just the one and then you discover the 14 existence of the other four? 15 MS. HAGGERTY: Yeah. 16 MR. KREBS: Who was doing the due 17 diligence in connection with these put-18 backs at that time? 19 MS. HAGGERTY: The quality control 20 group at EMC. And, as I said earlier, 21 some of those reviews were done by 22 employees of EMC and some of the reviews 23 were outsourced to Advitech. And there 24 may have been other outsource companies, 25 but Advitech was the major one.

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010

MR. KREBS: When it came to offering RMBS mortgage-backed securities, would all of these methods that you have described of acquiring loans, would they funnel those loans into the package of loans that were to be securitized?

MS. HAGGERTY: Typically, yes.

MR. KREBS: So we could -- you couldn't count on just one methodology unless that was -- well, how -- how -- how could you -- how can you distinguish, based on any records that we have -- have shown you, whether or not Bear was just a underwriter, a pure underwriter, and not a seller as well as an underwriter? I don't suppose that there is a method that we could go back in and determine which one of the underwritings done -- I mean the due diligence done by Clayton and other due diligence firms was done in connection with the underwriting for another seller.

MS. HAGGERTY: Well, presumable, Clayton should have that data, because

FCIC INTERVIEW OF MARY HAGGERTY - 08/17/2010 when they were engaged, they should presumably know that. You know, whether or not they kept it at that level or not, I don't know.

You know, the other thing that we don't know from the Clayton reports is the product mix. I mean some of these could be jumbo-A products that we bought from Wells Fargo or Countrywide. And -- and we did quite a bit of that in the adjustable rate markets.

MR. KREBS: It may very well be that we have the ability to go back and find that. I will get in touch with you in the event that I do.

How are these mortgages packaged and securitized? How are they sold to investors?

MS. HAGGERTY: Bear Stearns and EMC had a number of different shelf names that they use to create the securities.

And it was -- the shelves were pretty much arranged by general product type.

So there might be one shelf that was used

to securitize subprime. There would be a shelf or a number of shelf designations used to securitize an offer: adjustable rate jumbo, fixed rate jumbo, adjustable rate Alt-A, fixed rate Alt-A, second liens, home equity lines of credit, scratch and dent product. So there were a number of different shelf designations that were really a way of kind of segregating the different product types to be pooled and securitized.

MR. KREBS: Were any of them -- is it your understanding they were also unregistered offerings, as opposed to 144A offerings?

MS. HAGGERTY: There may have been 144A from time to time, but I believe, primarily, they were SEC shelf registrations.

MR. KREBS: Now, you -- did you have anything to do with meeting with and consulting with the rating agencies in connection with these offerings?

MS. HAGGERTY: Earlier in my career,

1.3

2.3